

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION,

Plaintiff

v.

SAFEWAY, INC.,

Defendant

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-cv-01352

[PROPOSED]

JURY TRIAL DEMAND

NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is an action under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended by the ADA Amendments Act of 2008, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et. seq.*, (ADA and ADAAA) to correct unlawful employment practices on the basis of disability and to provide appropriate relief to Joel Sibert, who is adversely affected by such practices. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC or Commission) alleges that Safeway, Inc. (Defendant) discriminated against Mr. Sibert, a deaf applicant, when it failed to provide a reasonable accommodation in the interview process and failed to hire him.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1
2 1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 451, 1331, 1337,
3 1343 and 1345. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to Section 107(a) of the ADA,
4 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1) and (3) (Title VII), and pursuant to Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act
5 of 1991, 42 U.S.C. § 1981a.

6 2. The employment practices alleged to be unlawful were committed within the
7 jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington.
8

PARTIES

9
10 3. Plaintiff, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, is the agency of the
11 United States of America charged with the administration, interpretation, and enforcement of
12 Title VII, and is expressly authorized to bring this action by Sections 107(a) of the ADA, 42
13 U.S.C. § 12117(a), which incorporates by reference Sections 706(f)(1) and (3) of Title VII, 42
14 U.S.C. 2000e-4(f)(1).
15

16 4. At all relevant times, Defendant has been a corporation continuously doing
17 business in the State of Washington and employing at least fifteen (15) employees.

18 5. At all relevant times, Defendant has continuously been an employer engaged in an
19 industry affecting commerce under Section 101 (5) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12111(5), and
20 Section 101(7) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111(7), which incorporates by reference Sections 701
21 (g) and (h) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§2000e(g) and (h).
22

23 6. At all relevant times, Defendant has been a covered entity under Section 101(2) of
24 the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12111(2).
25

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

7. More than thirty (30) days prior to the institution of this lawsuit, Joel Sibert filed a charge of discrimination with the Commission alleging that Defendant discriminated against him in violation of the ADA.

8. By letter dated July 5, 2018, the Commission issued to Defendant a Determination finding reasonable cause to believe that Defendant violated the ADA and invited Defendant to join with the EEOC in informal methods of conciliation to endeavor to eliminate the discriminatory practices and provide appropriate relief.

9. The EEOC communicated with Defendant to provide Defendant the opportunity to remedy the discriminatory practices described in the EEOC's Letter of Determination.

10. The EEOC was unable to secure from Defendant a conciliation agreement acceptable to the Commission.

11. By letter dated August 16, 2018, the EEOC issued to Defendant notice that efforts to conciliate were unsuccessful and that further conciliation efforts would be futile or non-productive.

12. All conditions precedent to the institution of this lawsuit have been fulfilled.

STATEMENT OF CLAIMS

13. Since at least August 28, 2017, Defendant has engaged in unlawful employment practices in violation of Section 102(a) of Title I of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12112(a). Defendant discriminated against Joel Sibert when it failed to provide a reasonable accommodation to Mr. Sibert to enable a job interview and when it failed to hire him for a position at Store #1551 in Seattle, Washington, in violation of section 102(a) and (b) of the ADA.

1 14. Charging Party Joel Sibert is a qualified individual with a disability who, under
2 sections 3 and 101(8) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12102 and 12111(8), can perform the essential
3 functions of the position with or without reasonable accommodation. Mr. Sibert is deaf. He is
4 substantially limited in the major life activities of hearing and communicating with others.

5 15. Mr. Sibert's physical impairment—deafness—is expressly identified as a
6 disability in the ADAAA regulations. 29 C.F.R. §1630(2)(j)(3)(iii).

7 16. In 2017, Mr. Sibert filled out an application for employment on Respondent's
8 website.

9 17. Mr. Sibert's application expressed interest in working in as a Food Clerk, Courtesy
10 Clerk, Produce Clerk, and Starbucks Clerk.

11 18. Defendant reviewed Mr. Sibert's application, determined that he met the minimum
12 qualifications for the job, and marked him eligible for an interview.

13 19. On August 28, 2017, the In-Store Recruiter for Defendant's Store #1551, called
14 Mr. Sibert to ask him to attend an in-person interview for vacant positions she was filling for the
15 store.

16 20. During this call Mr. Sibert informed the In-Store Recruiter that he was deaf and
17 would require an American Sign Language (ASL) interpreter during his interview and during
18 orientation for the position if he was hired.

19 21. The In-Store Recruiter told Mr. Sibert that she did not know about providing an
20 interpreter for an interview and would call him back.

21 22. The In-Store Recruiter did not call Mr. Sibert back.
22
23
24
25

1 B. Order Defendant to institute and carry out policies, practices, and programs which
2 provide equal employment opportunities for qualified individuals with disabilities, and which
3 eradicate the effects of its past and present unlawful employment practices.

4 C. Order Defendant to make whole Joel Sibert by providing appropriate back pay with
5 prejudgment interest, in amounts to be determined at trial, and other affirmative relief necessary
6 to eradicate the effects of its unlawful employment practices, including but not limited to front
7 pay.
8

9 D. Order Defendant to make whole Joel Sibert by providing compensation for past and
10 future pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described in
11 paragraphs 25 through 31 above, including job search and related expenses, in amounts to be
12 determined at trial.

13 E. Order Defendant to make whole Joel Sibert by providing compensation for past and
14 future non-pecuniary losses resulting from the unlawful employment practices described in
15 paragraphs 13 through 24 above, including emotional pain, suffering, inconvenience, loss of
16 enjoyment of life, and humiliation, in amounts to be determined at trial.
17

18 F. Order Defendant to pay punitive damages for its malicious and reckless conduct, as
19 described in paragraphs 13 through 24 above, in amounts to be determined at trial.

20 G. Grant such further relief as the Court deems necessary and proper in the public
21 interest.

22 H. Award the Commission its costs in this action.
23

24 **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

25 The Commission requests a jury trial on all questions of fact raised by this Complaint.

1 DATED this _10th_ day of September, 2017.

2
3 ROBERTA L. STEELE
4 Regional Attorney

JAMES L. LEE
Deputy General Counsel

5 JOHN F. STANLEY
6 Supervisory Trial Attorney

GWENDOLYN Y. REAMS
Associate General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
131 "M" Street NE
Washington, D.C. 20507

7 TERI HEALY
8 Senior Trial Attorney

9 BY: /s/ Roberta L. Steele
10 Regional Attorney
11 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
12 COMMISSION
13 Seattle Field Office-San Francisco District
14 909 First Avenue, Suite 400
15 Seattle, WA 98104-1061
16 Telephone (415) 522-3150

17
18 Attorneys for Plaintiff EEOC
19
20
21
22
23
24
25